# The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI. ST. LOUIS, MO., FEBRUARY 18, 1904. No. 7.

## ARCHBISHOP FARLEY AND THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

THE New York *Times* of the 27th ult., under the heading, "Catholic University Funds," made mention of the special meeting of the Board of Trustees then soon to be held at Washington, and, as indicating the business which was likely to come before the meeting, it gave what must be considered a fair summary of various events making up the recent history of the University. Foremost among these was the effort to provide funds for the support of that institution. No one of our readers but knows of the financial straits to which the University has lately been reduced. That the prestige acquired by a promising start had declined, and that its usefulness, as a centre of Catholic learning, had not been realized, was equally well known. Indeed no less a personage than the late Pope Leo XIII. stated, shortly before his death, that the University had not responded to his expectations. (See THE REVIEW, Vol. X, p. 302). Some months ago and after the government of the University had passed into the hands of the archbishops of this country, Msgr. O'Connell was sent to Rome to report to the Holy Father in regard to its condition and prospects. So urgent then was the need of funds, that the Rector was further commissioned to obtain from the Holy See its sanction of a plan which had been devised by the archbishops, of taking up a collection annually for ten years in every diocese in the United States in aid of the University. This consent was obtained, and the first collection has recently been made, with what result we are not yet definitely informed.

In the course of its narrative, the *Times* mentioned the fact that the Jesuits have no institution connected with the University, and added: "It is now declared in Catholic circles that as a way out of

this difficulty, representatives of the Jesuits or Dominicans will be asked to step in and take charge of chairs in the faculty."

These statements seem to have ruffled the serenity of the Archbishop of New York, for on the very day they were published, the *Evening Post* appeared with "Archbishop Farley's Denial" prominently inserted, telling us that the Archbishop, "aroused by reports" (referring manifestly to the *Times* article), had made public the statement that "no crisis has come in the affairs of the Catholic University at Washington," and that "the teaching orders, Jesuits or Dominicans, will not be asked to take charge of any chairs in the faculty." "It has never been suggested to the trustees of the University *from any source that had the right to make the suggestion* [Italics ours] that the teaching orders should become a part of the faculty."

It had not been stated in the *Times* article that the affairs of the University had come to a crisis. That its finances had run low, seems to be conceded by the Archbishop, and that the extraordinary plan had been resorted to of taxing Catholics all over the country for the support of the University, is equally certain. Indeed, Archbishop Farley says in the same published statement, "in this" [his own] "diocese the collection has exceeded my expectations by some thousand dollars," but, until we know the figures we can hardly judge how successful the collection has been or how moderate were the Archbishop's expectations. When a business corporation, instead of paying dividends, assesses its stockholders in order to make up the deficit in its running expenses and so to keep out of the hands of a receiver, it may not be necessary to describe the situation as a crisis. Nevertheless, if a similar assessment were advertised to be made during several successive years, the stockholders would either stop paying and give up their stock, or would strive for a change in the company's management and methods.

In his statement the Archbishop tells us that the annual deficit in the University's finances is between $20,000 and $25,000, truly a paltry sum for which to put the whole country under contribution—and he expresses the belief that the entire collection will not fall short of a hundred thousand dollars. This is considerably less than the several hundred thousand dollars so confidently expected by Msgr. O'Connell. [See N. Y. *Sun* interview, quoted in THE REVIEW, vol. x, p. 509.] If however the sum of $100,000 has been realized, then, undoubtedly, the trustees of the University are to be congratulated upon their relief from the pressing money question.

But is there not something incongruous in the association of two such ideas as success in the quest for money and the exclu-

sion of the teaching orders of the Church from participation in the work of the University? Let the champions of the latter not deceive themselves: A plethoric bank account and a successful Catholic University are by no means synonymous terms. The two things may be as wide apart as the poles. Profound learning and high thinking, lofty ideals, steadfastness of character, wisdom combined with prudence, intellectuality with humility and an unselfish devotion to the truth, all conforming harmoniously with the spirit of the Church—these are essentials which are implied in the very idea of a Catholic University worthy of the name, and they are the very things which money can not purchase, no matter how abundant the supply. (Cfr. the utterance of an eminent Cardinal, close to Pius X., in Vol. XI, No. 5 of THE REVIEW.)

And when Archbishop Farley hastens to publish to the world that the University has been financially relieved, and in the same breath declares that the teaching orders in the Church, whether Jesuits, Dominicans or others, will not be admitted to the faculty of the University, we fear many will interpret his statement, under the circumstances, as a manifestation of that deplorable spirit of antagonism toward the religious orders which may be met with in some clerical circles, but which, we are happy to say, is almost unknown among the Catholic laity in this country.

Passing for the moment the question of the wisdom or justice of such a policy as the Archbishop proclaims, his public advertisement of it, under the circumstances, we make bold to say, was tactless and unnecessary. And it was impolitic to the last degree; for nothing could have been planned which would more surely alienate the sympathies of the laity, especially those of superior education, from the University, than such an arbitrary exclusion of the religious orders from the charmed circle of its faculty. We do not need to argue how novel, how fantastic is the scheme by which membership in a religious order is made a disqualification for a chair in the University. It is at variance with the opinions held by great men who were identified with university work in times past, and we leave it to Archbishop Farley and his associate trustees, whose spokesman he has become, to justify and explain it as they may be able. When in 1852, Cardinal Newman was made Rector of the new Irish Catholic University, he spoke of the "earnest wish in the promoters and advocates of this great undertaking to get the best men for its execution, wherever they are to be found, in England, or in France, or in Belgium, or in Germany, or in Italy, or in the United States" (Historical Sketches, Vol. III, p. 69); and elsewhere in the same essay he writes of securing "the tip-top men of the age" for the professorships in the University. Any suggestions that these "tip-top men" should be

only such as might be found outside the religious orders, would doubtless have amused that great scholar, whose knowledge of the history of those orders and of the methods, needs, and development of universities, was at least equal to that possessed by any of the trustees at Washington.

Indeed, when that institution was in its inception and the ideal university was in the mind of Bishop Keane, its first Rector, he wrote or inspired the statement that "its professors and tutors might be chosen from among the most eminent men of every rank and order, whether secular, religious or lay, and from any nation." (See *American Ecclesiastical Review*, 1889, p. 245, quoted in THE REVIEW, vol. x, p. 703), and moved by this proper sentiment he sought, but unsuccessfully, to get that most distinguished theologian among the Jesuits, Father Lehmkuhl, to fill the chair of moral theology at Washington. (THE REVIEW, vol. x, p. 639).

It is not for us to prefer who shall be admitted to the faculty of the University at Washington. The right and responsibility of a wise selection belongs to the hierarchy, controlled fortunately by the wisdom of the Sacred Congregation of Studies at Rome. If eminent scholars shall be found whose character and whose teaching can win back for the University that confidence for want of which it now suffers, it is immaterial whether these shall be supplied from the secular, religious or lay order. The determination to exclude them because they may belong to a religious order, can only operate to the detriment of those who formulate such a narrow policy and must prove more disastrous to the fortunes of the University than it can possibly be to the orders.

## REAL OR APPARENT DEATH IN RELATION TO THE HOLY SACRAMENTS.

What is the precise moment in which man really dies? in which the soul is separated from the body? This question, which has been discussed of late among the theologians of Spain, is not a new question, but the advance of science has brought it up anew. From numerous experiences it seems certain that a man is not dead at the moment when the bystanders usually believe he is.

But if he is not dead, it follows that something can still be done for his eternal salvation, perhaps even for the restoration of his health. So far, man was abandoned from the moment he was commonly declared to be dead; neither were the sacraments administered nor any efforts made to restore him to life, although life was extinct only apparently. At present the contrary prac-

tice is extending more and more, and many have been recalled to life who were thought to be corpses.

But the restoration to life is the duty of the physician; we are concerned with the salvation of the soul by means of the sacraments. At the request of the editors of *Razón y Fe*, the medical faculty of the University of Barcelona took up the question of real or apparent death and discussed it in its meetings of Jan. 8, 15, 22, and 29, 1903. Dr. Blanc defended the thesis that "no one dies at the moment which is vulgarly judged to be the last of life, but some time afterwards." At the end of the third session he was requested by Dr. Cirera to formulate his statements more specifically. He did so in the fourth session, in which sixteen propositions were discussed and unanimously approved by all the members of the faculty. Assuming as true these propositions, the Rev. Juan B. Ferreres, S. J., draws from them important conclusions in regard to the administration of the sacraments to those supposedly dead.*)

We first take up the chapter on the administration of baptism of foeti and newly born infants that are probably dead.

According to common opinion, the foetus is animated by the soul from the moment of conception; hence is an apt subject for baptism and must be baptized if for any reason it is prematurely ejected from the womb and shows certain signs of life.

All theologians likewise admit that the foetus or newly born babe, if probably alive, should be baptized *sub-conditione:* "If thou art alive, I baptize thee, etc." The same must be done when it is *doubtful* whether the child lives. Ballerini-Palmieri (3 ed., vol. iv, no. 751,) puts it tersely thus: "Every foetus that shows a sign of life must be baptized unconditionally; conditionally, if it does not."

If, according to the common consent of theologians, every foetus that is probably or possibly still alive, must be baptized, we have to determine only how long it is probable or dubious that a foetus or newly born infant is still living, despite apparent lifelessness.

The famous Pastoral Instruction of the Diocese of Eichstädt (No. 85) lays down this norm: Baptism must be administered whenever there are no certain signs of putrefaction. (Instr. Pastoralis Eystettensis, ed. 5, Friburgi-Brisgoviae, 1902.)

According to Dr. Surbled (La Vie sexuelle, l. 5, c. 2) decomposition and putrefaction are the only certain signs of death in the foetus. Hence, baptism must be administered before they set in. The same is said by Dr. Viader y Pairachs (in his medico-moral discourse, tit. 19, page 190), and also by Eschbach (Quaest. physiol.-theol., ed. 2, disp. 3, p. 2, c. 3, a. 3.)

---

*) Cf. *Razón y Fe*, vol. viii, No. 1.

The reason is that both foetus and newly born infant frequently present themselves in a state of apparent death that may last for hours or even days. Many of them have been restored to life after hours and days in which they were believed to be dead, nay even after having been buried.

And it must be noted that in foeti or newly born babes the first indications of putrefaction may be easily confounded with other symptoms.

Father Ferreres gives a long list of cases in which apparent death was overcome by the physician, especially by means of rythmical tractions of the tongue, a new method invented and perfected by Dr. Laborde. Particulars may be read in *Razón y Fe*, l. c. We shall confine ourselves to the practical conclusions drawn therefrom.

In the first place, the physician must make every effort to revive a babe, apparently born dead, but not showing sure signs of putrefaction. Many a child would have come to life had the physician spent as many hours in his efforts of revival as he used minutes.

In the second place, those assisting at a birth or an abortion must administer baptism, unless certain signs of putrefaction are visible.

In the third place, priests having the care of souls must instruct the faithful, particularly the married, that in no case a foetus must be left unbaptized, unless it be found in the state of complete decomposition. We believe that carelessness in this regard is great, and many souls could and should be saved for heaven.

The formula for baptism in any doubtful case is: "If thou art alive, I baptize thee in the name, etc."

Should the expelled foetus be enwrapped in the placenta, it must first be baptized over it; but as such a baptism is doubtful, the foetus should be plunged in water, the membrane torn with the fingers and the words pronounced: "If thou art alive and not baptized, I baptize thee, etc."

(Cf. Eschbach. l. c., page 321; Villada, Casus, vol. 3, pages 261, 262; Capellmann, Med. Pastor., page 112, foot-note.)

* * *

——We notice from *Dominicana* (v, 2) that the great "Albertus Magnus University" of Merwin-Marie Snell is still in the field at Wichita, Kans., and that its "Correspondence Department" offers to confer the degrees of Ph. B., Ph. L., and Ph. D. for fifty dollars and upwards, presumably with the approbation of His Lordship the Rt. Rev. Bishop John J. Hennessy, who, we understand, to his many other duties has also assumed that of acting editor of the struggling *Catholic Advance*.

## "REMEMBER THE MAINE."

Our readers will remember that in February, 1898, the United States battleship Maine was blown up in Havana harbor. There was not a tittle of evidence brought forward to show that the sad catastrophe, by which a large number of American officers and sailors were suddenly launched into eternity, was caused by treachery on the part of any Spaniard or Spaniards. Yet there is no doubt that this catastrophe had a great effect in precipitating the war with Spain. Many journals which advocated the war made use of the event to excite the American people to revenge the supposed treachery of the Spaniards, thousands of fiery editorials being written in which it was assumed that the Maine was blown up by a torpedo which was put into position and exploded by the Spaniards. It became fashionable to assert that the Spanish government was responsible for the hypothetical outrage, and the demand was made persistently that Spain should be punished, without any opportunity being given to prove her innocence of the crime which was attributed to her.

It is now generally, and we may say universally, admitted that Spain was in no wise responsible for the occurrence, which was, in all probability, an accident arising from the explosive material with which the Maine, like every battleship, was supplied. But the fact did its work, and the papers with their fiery headlines in display type, made the war-cry of the people to be "Remember the Maine," and with this cry in their mouths, and with vengeful feelings in their hearts, the soldiers and sailors of the United States went into battle. We all know the result: the Spaniards were driven out of their West Indian and Malaysian possessions, and the Spanish fleet was utterly destroyed after a short but sharp contest. But a few days ago, a United States Senator, Hon. Mr. Teller of Colorado, declared on the floor of the Senate chamber the conviction of the country and of himself, that Spain was entirely innocent of the shameful crime with which she was charged. He said:

"Nobody knows, nobody can prove, nobody ever did prove, and it can not be proven to-day that either Cuban or Spaniard had anything to do with the blowing up of the ship. I heard one of the best military men now in the service of the United States say within a month, that he believed the ship was blown up by the powder that it had on board, which went off without any action of either Cuban or Spaniard."

Senator Teller had had ample opportunity to know all that can be known regarding the origin of the explosion, and this is his deliberate pronouncement on the case; but we know on the

other hand that the United States government effectually and deliberately burked all efforts to ascertain the truth of the matter. The Spanish government repudiated the crime and asked for a thorough investigation into the affair. There was a form of investigation, indeed, under the auspices of the United States government after the war was ended, and a decision was given hurriedly that the ship was blown up from the outside; but if it had been intended to make the investigation an honest one, the Spaniards would have been allowed to share in it. So far was this from being the case that, as soon as the one-sided investigation was over, the Americans raised the wreck, removed it so that any honest investigation was rendered impossible; and this was done with unseemly haste.

It was our belief from the beginning that the Spaniards were innocent in the matter, and we so expressed ourselves at the time. Our conviction was strengthened by the evident one-sidedness of the investigation, which appears to have been carried on in such a way as to seem to justify the American newspapers which raised the exasperating cry of "Remember the Maine," and to justify also the government for its conduct in aiding the Cuban insurrection for the three years during which it lasted, and in truth for even a longer period, and also for declaring war when all the difficulties might have been easily settled by diplomatic negotiations.

The above remarks are taken substantially from a Canadian contemporary, the *Catholic Record* (No. 1316). Our readers know that we have from the beginning taken the same position, and we now reprint the *Record's* article as expressing the sentiments of all sensible and justice-loving Americans.

In this connection Ex-Secretary Long's account (in his History of the American Navy, just published) of the way in which the news of the blowing-up of the Maine was received by the Cabinet, is valuable and interesting. "On the receipt of the telegram announcing the explosion," he says, "it was manifest that the loss of the Maine would *inevitably* lead to war, even if it were shown that Spain was *innocent* of her destruction." What an extraordinary confession for a cabinet officer of the United States to make! An American warship had been sunk, whether because of an accident or by intent, and therefore the United States was certain to go to war, right or wrong. It was not to matter whether the responsibility lay with the ship's own crew, with Cuban revolutionists seeking to bring about a war, or with hot-headed Spanish officers. In any event there were more lives to be taken—more than 5,000 American lives in Cuba and our home death-camps—because somebody had blundered or some miscreant had committed a shocking crime. "But," Mr. Long explains, "time was neces-

sary"—before war could be declared—"to enable completion of our preparations for conflict. From every point of view hasty action was inadvisable. The President desired to give the civilized world no ground for criticising the American republic." How are we to believe that, since the blowing-up of the Maine "must inevitably lead to war," Mr. McKinley "sought to preserve peace, but to be prepared for war in case it was forced upon him"? Or that the American people awaited the outcome of the enquiry "with admirable poise"? Is any poise of cabinet or executive or people admirable which is the result of a predetermination to go to war under such conditions as those of 1898?

## NEW MUSIC.

*Short Instructions in the Art of Singing Plain Chant*, with an Appendix containing all Vesper Psalms and the Magnificat, Responses for Vespers, the Antiphones of the B. V. M. and various Hymns for Benediction. Designed for the use of Catholic choirs and schools. By J. Singenberger. 4th edition. New York and Cincinnati, Fr. Pustet & Co. Price 25 cts.

This is a very timely publication just now when the Supreme Pontiff is urging the whole Catholic world to restore the Gregorian chant to its rightful place in the liturgical functions of the Church.

The same firm publishes *XII Cantiones ecclesiasticae* for three equal voices by J. Auer, op. 43. Score 45 cts., parts 20 cts. The numbers contained in the collection are: "Pange lingua," "Sacris solemniis," "Bone Pastor," "O sacrum convivium," "O salutaris hostia," "Hymus de SS. Corde Jesu," "Ave Maria," "Sub tuum praesidium," "Tota pulchra es," "Hymnus de S. Joseph," "Pro Summo Pontifice," and "Psalm 116." All these compositions are easy, well sounding, and may be performed by either women's or children's or men's voices.

*VII Motecta a Luca Marentio* [Nos. 8—14] and *VII Motecta* by the same author [Nos. 15-21] for four mixed voices adapted to present choir conditions by M. Haller [Pustet and Co. Score, 20 cts.] are among the most important contributions to the literature of liturgical music of recent years. They are glorious works and not very difficult of performance. Rev. Dr. Haller has written a very instructive preface to each one of the volumes. A veritable treat for director and choir alike are these motettes. They were originally published in Dr. Haberl's *Kirchenmusikalisches Jahrbuch*.

*Zweistimmige Offertorien mit obligater Orgelbegleitung.* 26 original compositions by Auer, Diebold, Ebner, Goller, Griesbacher, Haller, Kornmüller, Piel, and Quadflieg.

This is the third and last volume of the offertories for the whole liturgical year which have been published as musical supplements to Dr. Haberl's *Musica Sacra*, beginning with the year 1890. It is needless to say anything in commendation of this collection. The names of the authors are a sufficient guarantee of the excellency of its contents. Most of the numbers are easy of execution and the work makes it possible for choirs to sing the proper offertory on every Sunday without much rehearsing. (Pustet & Co. Score 40 cts., parts 20 cts.)

*Haller's Missa Prima* [op. 4], originally composed for soprano, alto, and bass, has been arranged by J. Quadflieg for four mixed voices and organ obligato. The arrangement by Quadflieg meets with the hearty approval of the venerable and celebrated author. The work is comparatively easy of performance. [Pustet & Co. Score 50 cts.]

*Felix Aeternus or the Christmas Bride.* An Operetta. Libretto by Andrew F. Klarmann. Music by T. L. Halm. Pustet & Co. Price 60 cts.

The music must have been written by an amateur, judging from the construction. It is of a distressingly banal and monotonous character. There are also incongruities in the plan of the libretto. The words spoken by the different characters too often produce the very effect which the author in his remarks and directions seems to wish to avoid. The children are not child-like and the grown people are not mature. The verses for the songs and choruses are often no more than mere jingles, and this is the more noticeable a defect in that the subject matter is so serious. We must have a more organic, a more live style when we are dealing with realities. JOSEPH OTTEN.

## BOOK REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTES.

*Jesus Christ The Word Incarnate.* Considerations Gathered from the Work of St. Thomas Aquinas by Roger Freddi, S. J. Translated from the Italian by F. J. Sullivan, S. J. B. Herder. St. Louis. 1904. Price $1.25.

The editor of the "New Thought Magazine," *Mind*, in the February number says: "Never in the history of the world has there

been such a searching out after God as in our present time." Alas for these searchers, the way is made difficult to find the veritable Word of the Most High, God with us, by reason of the number and variety of Christs that Protestantism has foisted upon the age by means of individual interpretations of the Bible, and the Orient by means of the Swami. Yet in the book above noted these searchers after God may find a true and scientific guide to that uncreated and personal Word which from all eternity was spoken unchangeably in the mind of God. It was this Word that in the fullness of time took to Himself human nature without human generation, in order to bestow on men a participation in His divinity, to bring to reasoning mortals knowledge of the unknown and otherwise unknowable world of infinite uncreated beauty, wisdom, love, and truth.

A scientific exposition is not specially adapted to the poor, and Jesus Christ, the Word Incarnate, adapted Himself in His earth-life and His Church very specially to the poor of every grade. "The poor have the Gospel preached to them," said Christ to the messengers sent by John (Matt. xi. 5). But that preaching, reduced to first principles, as in the considerations given in Freddi's able work, is equally adapted to the most learned philosophers of every age and nation—to non-Catholic searchers as well as to thoughtful, loving Catholics. St. Thomas Aquinas brought the mystery of the Word Incarnate down to these scientific principles through his pen, guided by the angelic purity of his mind and will. "With Jesus Christ there are connected the most sublime and profound mysteries of our religion....and for this reason," says the author in his preface, "we wished to extract them from no other mines than from the pure and most precious mine of Aquinas, who discourses so well and so divinely on everything, but above everything on Jesus Christ."

Could I, an unworthy admirer of such excellence, offer richer inducements to those who in this vale of trial would see clearer into the beyond—whether with in or outside the Church of Christ, than by advising all to take up and master, as far as may be, these considerations on Jesus Christ the Word Incarnate?—E. A. A.

——Heft 2 of the *historisch-politische Blätter* contains the first portion of a review of Denifle's new book on Luther and Lutheranism; a paper in commemoration of the hundredth birthday of the painter Moritz von Schwind; a detailed report of the nineteenth Italian Catholic Congress at Bologna (cfr. THE REVIEW, xi, 3); a political letter from Switzerland; another on the situation in Tyrol; a valuable account of the combat waged between Russia and England for the supremacy in Asia; and a brief review of Armstrong's new two-volume history of Charles V.

# MINOR TOPICS.

*Tourists and the Custom House.*—Secretary Shaw has adopted a new system for informing American tourists in the Old World of their rights and obligations with respect to the payment of customs duties on their baggage when they return. A circular of information will be mailed under an individual address to every person whose name is on the passenger list of any outgoing steamship. The mailing will be done by a customs officer at each port, and the circulars delivered, with the other mail, on board the ship before starting. By an ingenious device, each circular when opened becomes a convenient little book, fitting neatly into an inside coat pocket.

In this new circular the most important feature for the purposes of tourists generally will be the passage headed "Residents of the United States," and reading as follows:

"A resident of the United States returning thereto is entitled to bring with him, free of duty, personal effects taken abroad by him as baggage, provided they have not been remodelled or improved abroad so as to increase their value, and in addition thereto, articles purchased or otherwise obtained abroad, of a total value not exceeding one hundred dollars. Such articles may be for the use of the persons bringing them, or for others, but not for sale.

"(To prevent the use of the foregoing provision as a cloak for smuggling, customs officials are instructed to enquire into the bona fides of the journey and the actual ownership of the goods. Either the presence of an unusual amount of any class of highly dutiable merchandise, or frequent and hasty journeys, is sufficient to raise the presumption of bad faith. Such cases will be subject to most careful scrutiny and prosecution.)

"All articles obtained abroad, whether exempt from duty or otherwise, should be declared, and an allowance of one hundred dollars for articles obtained abroad will be made by the deputy collector upon the pier."

Here, it will be observed, is the opening which so many tourists have complained did not exist—the chance to exempt trifles brought in as gifts.

The broader view of the new Treasury circular is not an attempt by Secretary Shaw, on his own initiative, to override the judgment of the appraisers, but is based on a decision by the Circuit Court of Appeals at New York, in the case of the United States vs. One Pearl Necklace.

*Compulsory Arbitration in New Zealand.*—In No. 16 of last year's REVIEW we gave a synopsis of New Zealand's compulsory arbitration law, according to Henry Demarest Lloyd's book 'A Country Without Strikes,' and on general principles warned our readers against the optimism of that writer. In No. 19 we reported a case of arbitration that gave no satisfaction to the parties concerned. Of late we have read a lengthy exposition of the New Zealand arbitration laws in the Bulletin of our Bureau of Labor [No. 49], in which the author states that neither the work-

men nor the employers, much less unorganized labor and the general public, are satisfied with the workings of the system. "An idea laboratory" is what a canny Scotch labor leader called New Zealand, and the Bulletin writer adds: "Such it is indeed; and we must consider her legislation as laboratory experiments for ourselves." He finds the conditions in the United States entirely different from those prevailing in New Zealand, with its 800,000 inhabitants, of whom but 20,000 are gathered in labor, and less than 2,000 in employers' unions. Recently our esteemed Madrid exchange, the *Razón y Fe* (vol. viii, No. 3), also had a long article on compulsory arbitration in New Zealand. It winds up by saying that, on the whole, the situation in European countries is too much unlike that of New Zealand, to make it feasible to adopt the New Zealand system. It has not found any particular flaw in the working of the plan, but takes for granted (what Cardinal Moran of Australia said, in an interview published by the Paris *Univers* of June, 1902) that the present prosperity of New Zealand is due to the union of Church and people in the islands—an assertion about as true as that of an American bishop at the Eucharistic Congress of Namur, that in his whole diocese he had not a single Catholic man who neglected to perform his Easter duties. The writer doubts whether such conditions will last, whether in the near future some demagogs will not deprive the people of their Christian sentiments and bring on a bitter class-war which will drive capital out of the country and leave it without money, credit or work.

***Recommending Emerson to Catholic Young Men.***—The Boston *Republic*, which cultivates "the higher Catholic journalism," advises "its young men readers" (xxxiv, 5) "to devote more time to Emerson. He is sane; there is no affectation about him; he stood for the amnly life—which is a hundred per cent. better than the strenuous life. Once you understand that his philosophy is a dilution of moonshine and echoes of Eastern religions, he can not tarnish your Catholic philosophy nor dim your Catholic principles. He was a noble son of this great Bay State; and until we Irish-American young men drink deep at the fountains of New England sentiment and ideality we leave an important side of character undeveloped."

We have no idea what the "amnly life" was for which Emerson stood, and we utterly fail to see how the editor of a professedly Catholic newspaper, appealing to every-day Catholic readers, can reconcile it with his conscience to recommend the "Sage of Concord" indiscriminately as "sane" to Catholic young men. We of the "old school" have been taught and always held that Emerson is a dangerous writer for young men, particularly for young men without a solid philosophic training, because in treating of questions political, social, or scientific, he constantly introduces principles of a semi-religious or philosophic character which are absolutely false and all the more dangerous because so dexterously disguised by the beauty of style and force of illustration.

And even if he were not such a dangerous writer, why should our Catholic young men be advised to read Emerson, who "had no peculiar gifts as a religious thinker or philosopher," was not "learned in theology or philosophy" (Hecker), confessed him-

self to be incapable of sound and connected reasoning, and whose "philosophy" the *Republic* itself is constrained to characterize as an amalgam of "moonshine" and Oriental paganism?

Is it not a gross abuse of confidence for a Catholic newspaper to thus mislead its young readers, the majority of whom, even in "cultured" Boston, are boys without sufficient training to study an author so subtle as Ralph Waldo Emerson?

***The Hague Decision in the "Pious Fund" Case.***—It is some time since we acquainted our readers with the particulars of the famous Pious Fund case of the Californias (vol. ix, No. 32). A paper in the recent sumptuous jubilee edition of the San Francisco *Monitor* (No. 16) briefly summarizes the decision, and we reproduce this (presumably correct) summary for the sake of completeness:

"The United States chose as her arbitrators Sir Edward Fry of England and Professor Theodore de Martens of Russia. Mexico appointed Mr. Alexander Lohman of Holland and Senator Guarnaschelli of Italy, but, the latter resigning on account of his son's death, Professor Asser of Holland was chosen in his stead. These four settled on Mr. Matzer, President of the Danish Chamber of Deputies, as the fifth member of the Board, of whom not a single individual was a Catholic. September 13th, 1902, the case was formally opened, and October 13th, 1902, a unanimous decision was rendered in our favor. Mexico was condemned to pay $1,460,682 in Mexican currency within eight months as the interest due up to February 2nd, 1902. Moreover, to use the very words of the award: 'Mexico will pay.....February 2nd, 1903, and every following year on the same date forever, annual payment of $43,050 of the money of the legal currency of Mexico.' The decision did not compel Mexico to pay in gold. The first payment was made June 16th, 1903."

We have recently been asked for the full and authentic text of this Hague decision; can any of our readers tell us where it is to be found?

***The Jesuits and the Catholic University.***—We read in the *Catholic Telegraph* of Cincinnati (LXXIII, 4), which has close connections with members of the Society of Jesus:

"We think it hardly probable that the Jesuits will take charge of chairs in the faculty (of the Catholic University of America.) They have a splendid university of their own at Georgetown in the District of Columbia, which has a brilliant history of more than one hundred years. It is fully equipped and has in the neighborhood of eight hundred students. Moreover, it has about nine Jesuit colleges throughout the Eastern States, which serve as preparatory feeders for it; and it could hardly be expected that the Jesuits would care to patronize a secular institution which might be considered as running in opposition to their own, which had occupied that particular field a round century before the Catholic University of America was established.

"Besides the foregoing we might also state that the Jesuits have a fine old and growing university at St. Louis, Mo., which has well equipped philosophical, theological, medical, and scientific departments in splendid working order. The present year will hardly

elapse without a law department, second to none in the country, being affiliated. The St. Louis institution has seven or eight contributing colleges, so it need not fear the future.

"We think, therefore, that we have reason to presume that the Jesuits will not take charge of chairs at the Catholic University of America."

***Divorce Worse than Polygamy.***—Speaking of divorce "as an abettor of race suicide," Father M. P. Dowling, S. J., says in the *Messenger* (XLI, 1):

"I have never been able to understand why so much outcry has been raised against polygamy by the same persons who regard divorce as permissible. Polygamy exists only in a single remote territory, yet all eyes are turned upon the evil, while comparatively little attention is paid to a still more crying evil spread over the whole land and weakening the marriage bond even to the snapping point. Is there any difference between the two, but that one is simultaneous and the other successive polygamy? Both must be condemned, because God has forbidden them; but I do not hesitate to affirm that of the two polygamy is less opposed to the natural law than divorce, for instead of frustrating, it promotes the primary end of marriage, which is the continuation of human life on earth. I must be pardoned if, in this matter, I fall back on Christian principles, for I can not see how one who rejects them can logically oppose polygamy. Deny God and assert unlimited liberty, and where is the wrong of polygamy? Why should not a man have all the wives he wishes, if there is no God and no moral law to forbid it? That plague spot on the body politic can never be removed by infidel principles, and it is only to Christian sentiment and tradition that the unbeliever appeals for its destruction, when he comes between men and women to limit the extent of selection."

***The Plan of the Panama Canal*** is not, as one might be led to suppose from American newspaper articles, a Yankee invention. We know from Parkman, 'The Pioneers of France in the New World,' (Works, i, 239) that Champlain, during his trip to the West Indies (1600-1603) "visited the principal ports of the islands, made plans and sketches of them all, after his fashion, and then, landing at Vera Cruz, journeyed inland to the city of Mexico. On his return he made his way to Panama. Here, more than two centuries and a half ago" (now three centuries ago.—A. P.) "his bold and active mind conceived the plan of a ship-canal across the isthmus, 'by which,' he says, 'the voyage to the South Sea would be shortened by more than fifteen hundred leagues.' "

And in a note ibid. we are informed by the same historian

" '.....l'on accourciroit par ainsy le chemin de plus de 1500 lieues, et depuis Panama jusques au destroit de Magellan se seroit une isle, et de Panama jusques aux Terres Neufves une autre isle,' etc. Champlain, *Bref Discours*. A Biscayan pilot had before suggested the plan to the Spanish government; but Philip the Second, probably in the interest of certain monopolies, forbade the subject to be again brought forward on pain of death."

A learned German professor, in a lecture recently delivered at Berlin, even claimed that the plan of building an isthmian canal was broached and frequently discussed in the days of Charles V.

***Politicians First and Catholics Afterwards.***—The Milwaukee *Catholic Citizen* recently (Oct. 31st, 1903) observed that "when it comes to questions of politics, many of our co-religionists are Democrats first and Catholics afterwards." Mr. Griffin, in the January number of his *Historical Researches*, suggests that "politicians" be substituted for "Democrats," and generalizes the *Citizen's* statement by saying that on any public question of Catholic interest our people are "first for Party." This is, unfortunately, too true, and we hold it to be one of the chief tasks of Catholic Federation to teach our people that their religion requires them to be *Catholics first and politicians afterwards.* As American Catholics grow more enlightened, they will learn, moreover, that the true Catholic, in a country like ours, is not, and can not be, a partisan in the commonly accepted sense; that he is and must be, as it were a man without a party, nonpartisan, sufficiently independent to judge all political questions in the light of Catholic truth and to hold up to each and every party its right and wrong.

***Archbishop Kain's Baptismal Certificate.***—Mr. John T. Reily, of McSherrytown, Pa., "the historian of all that region for hundreds of miles round about," has supplied Mr. Griffin's *Researches* (Jan.) with the baptismal record of our late Archbishop Kain, from the old St. Joseph's parish register at Martinsburg, Va., now West Va. It reads:

"May 31, at the Dam, John, born March, 1840, son of Jeremiah and Ellen Cain. Sponsors, John Casey and Ellen Russell. R. Whelan, Pastor."

Father Whelan became later the first Bishop of Wheeling, and John Kain, (Joseph was his confirmation name), the second.

"The Dam" was along the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, Potomac River, and B. & O. Railroad. Jeremiah Kain worked on the B. & O. and removed from Strinesville to Martinsburg in 1842.

It is curious that the name is spelled "*C*ain" in the baptismal record.

——In the January number of the *Catholic University Bulletin*, the Rector announces that he has received from Rev. A. H. Walburg, of Cincinnati, the sum of ten thousand dollars for the purpose of establishing a chair of German language and literature in the University, and that he has received from another quarter the assurance of ten thousand dollars towards the completion of the fund. He expresses "the conviction that the remaining necessary moneys will not long be wanting." This happy consummation will, however, not be brought about by foolish circulars such as that issued the other day, presumably at the suggestion of the University authorities, by Mr. E. L. Scharf, and duly censured by the *Catholic Tribune* of Jan. 28th.

——Writing on the "Antiquity of the Angelus" in the January *Month*, Fr. Thurston gives reasons for assigning the origin of that devotion to the first half of the thirteenth century.